

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: November 10, 2010
Received: November 08, 2010
Status: Posted
Posted: November 09, 2010
Tracking No. 80b84b9e
Comments Due: November 08, 2010
Submission Type: Web

Docket: EPA-R03-OW-2010-0736

Draft Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load

Comment On: EPA-R03-OW-2010-0736-0001

Clean Water Act Section 303(d): Notice for the Public Review of the Draft Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for the Chesapeake Bay

Document: EPA-R03-OW-2010-0736-0484

Comment submitted by F. S. Hosenhans

Submitter Information

Submitter's Representative: Scott Josenhans

General Comment

This supercedes prior entries:

EPA-R03-OW-2010-0736-0306

EPA-R03-OW-2010-0736-0307

This commentary supercedes two previous entries to this record.

The two previous entries as identified as EPA-R03-OW-2010-0736-0306 and EPA-R03-OW-2010-0736-0307.

To Whom It May Concern:

This, my 5th attempt to be "heard" on record only serves to underscore my initial attempt which along with the second were wiped from the text window as the website announced that I had "timed out" The two entries that this is meant to supercede, were reflective of not only the limitations of the meeting as referenced below, but indeed compounded by some sort of "beat the clock" programming built into this electronic system of public record, beyond the specified character limit.

I would like to thank a certain "Scott" who replied me by phone and who was so very helpful seeing to it that this one 'voice' might be entered into the record. I suspect that there were many beyond myself who may not have persisted and have now gone figuratively unheard.

On October 6th, 2010, as a resident citizen of the Commonwealth of Virginia, I attended an EPA public meeting at the University of Richmond. Though being very appreciative of the strong efforts of my state's public servants and officials to compliment the citizenry through that very service, I was troubled by the manner in which the meeting, or perhaps better yet; forum, was conducted. At the outset the attendees were advised that no commentary would be entered into the public record save that which happened behind the podium. Blank cards were passed about to eager hands while being told that they would be screened in order to filter out those which were redundant. When the cards selected were read and addressed by panel members, it seem as if one of those soft ball interviews seen on the four letter cable news shows. In light of the limited number of attendees allowed to speak at the podium, the U of R Environmental Law Department staff and students seemed afforded unfair access as did at least one representative of a plaintiff in the Fowler v. EPA settlement. But a few voices were heard among the ranks of those likely to be most directly affected by this Bay process and they spoke well, respectfully and yielded respectfully as the red "stop sign" was presented. It is a

shame that there was no meeting that night but only a carefully crafted forum. I feel saddened that the constraints placed on dialog that night in Richmond and subsequently in this electronic forum have hinder true and free expressiveness on the subject.

I applaud the Commonwealth's efforts at improving our natural resources and seeking a holistically balanced approach in those efforts. We in Virginia value and truly appreciate humbly dedicated and effective government and when finding ourselves faced with a lesser example, we recognize and acknowledge it as such readily.

Let's all get our heads and hearts together on this with a spirit of mutual respect and humility. That couldn't hurt a bit!

Respectfully, F. Scott Josenhans,
Bon Air, Virginia